arXiv:1404.5705v4 [math.PR] 28 Sep 2015

Brownian excursions and critical quantum random graphs *

Amir Dembo† Anna Levit‡ Sreekar Vadlamani§

September 29, 2015

Abstract

The N vertices of a quantum random graph are each a circle independently punctured at Poisson points of arrivals, with parallel connections derived through for each pair of these punctured circles by yet another independent Poisson process. Considering these graphs at their critical parameters, we show that the joint law of the re-scaled by $N^{2/3}$ and ordered sizes of their connected components, converges to that of the ordered lengths of excursions above zero for a reflected Brownian motion with drift. Thereby, this work forms the first example of an inhomogeneous random graph, beyond the case of effectively rank-1 models, which is rigorously shown to be in the Erős-Rényi graphs universality class in terms of Aldous's results.

1 Introduction

The Erdős-Rényi random graph [8] is the simplest and most studied example of a random graph ensemble. Such a graph, denoted by $G(N,p)$, has N vertices, with each pair of vertices connected with probability p, independently of all other pairs. Its phase transition phenomena are well understood. In particular, for $p=\frac{c}{N}$ with $c>1$, the largest component in $G(N,p)$ has $\Theta(N)$ vertices and the second largest $\mathrm{O}(\ln N)$ vertices (as $N\to\infty$, with probability 1), for $p=\frac{c}{N}$ with $c<1$ the largest component has $\mathrm{O}(\ln N)$ vertices and when $p=\frac{1}{N}$, the largest component of $G(N,p)$ has $\Theta(N^{2/3})$ vertices (c.f. [8, 5, 18]).

Aldous [2] considered the asymptotic behavior of $G(N,p)$ inside the "scaling window" of this phase transition, namely for $N\to\infty$ and $|p-1/N|$ small enough, showing that the ordered set of component sizes rescaled by $N^{2/3}$ then converges to an ordered set of excursion

*AMS Subject Classifications: 05C80, 82B10, 60F17
Keywords and phrases: Quantum random graphs, critical point, scaling limits, Brownian excursions, weak convergence.

†Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Stanford University; Research funded by NSF grant DMS-11-06627.

‡Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia.
§TIFR Center for Applicable Mathematics, Bangalore.

lengths of reflected inhomogeneous Brownian motion with a certain drift. Various other random graph models exhibit a phase transition phenomenon similar to the Erdős-Rényi random graph. While some further follow the same behaviour as $G(N,p)$ in their near-critical regime, the near-critical regime of others falls into different universality classes.

For example, Nachmias and Peres [21] prove that the random graph ensemble obtained by performing percolation on a random d-regular ($d \geq 3$) graph on N vertices with percolation probability $p = 1/(d-1) + aN^{-1/3}$ for $a \in \mathbb{R}$ fixed, falls into the same universality class as the Erdős-Rényi random graph. The random multi-graph whose N vertices are constructed using the configuration model, with its vertex degrees being i.i.d. variables, each having the distribution ν, has a richer behavior. Indeed, Joseph [15] shows that when ν has a finite third moment, the near-critical regime of this model falls into the Erdős-Rényi random graph's universality class, whereas if $\nu_k \sim ck^{-\tau}$ as $k \to \infty$, $c > 0$, $\tau \in (3,4)$ then the relevant scaling changes to $N^{-(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)}$ and the limit is an ordered set of the excursion lengths of some other drifted process with independent increments above past minima (near-critical regime of the Erdős-Rényi universality class, is also obtained in [22] for more general class of degree distributions of finite third moment). A similar behavior has been found in the near critical regime of the Rank-1 model (a special case of the general in-homogeneous random graph studied in [6], which has received much attention recently). Such graph has random i.i.d. weights $\{x_i\}$ associated to its vertices, and edges chosen independently, with the edge (i,j) chosen with probability $p_{i,j} = \min\{c\frac{x_i x_j}{N}, 1\}$, for some positive constant $c = c(N)$ (c.f. [23]). For x_i having finite third moment, the near-critical regime corresponds to $c(N) = 1 + aN^{-1/3}$, in which case [2] shows that this model (formulated slightly differently), falls into the Erdős-Rényi graph's universality class (similar results have been later proved in [3, 24]). In contrast, for Rank-1 model with power-law degrees of exponent $\tau \in (3,4)$, [4] show that the sizes of the components, re-scaled by $N^{-(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)}$, converge to hitting times of certain thinned Lévy process.

Our aim here is to study the near-critical behavior of the so-called quantum random graph (QRG). We note in passing, that both the motivation and terminology come from the stochastic geometric (Fortuin–Kasteleyn type) representation of the quantum Curie-Weiss model at inverse temperature $\beta > 0$ (we exclude here the ground state case of $\beta = \infty$), in transverse magnetic field of strength $\lambda > 0$ (at $\lambda = 0$ it reduces to the Erdős-Rényi ensemble, see Remark 1.1). We refer the reader to [12] for more information on such stochastic geometric representations (that were originally developed in [1, 7] for the general ferromagnetic context), moving on instead, to the precise description of the QRG (as in [13]).

The model: With $G_N = \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and $\mathbb{S}_\beta$ denoting the circle of length β, let $\mathcal{G}_N^\beta = G_N \times \mathbb{S}_\beta$, associating to each site $i \in G_N$ the copy $\mathbb{S}_\beta^i = i \times \mathbb{S}_\beta$ of $\mathbb{S}_\beta$, so a point in $\mathcal{G}_N^\beta$ has two coordinates, its site (in G_N) and time (in $\mathbb{S}_\beta$) coordinates. The QRG is then the following random subset $\mathcal{G}_N^\beta \setminus \mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{G}_N^\beta$, equipped with random links $\bigcup_{i,j} \mathcal{L}_{i,j}$ between pairs of points of the type $\{(i,t)$ and (j,t), for $i \neq j\}$. To construct the QRG we first punch within each $\mathbb{S}_\beta^i$ finitely many holes, according to independent Poisson point processes $\mathcal{H}_i$, $i \in G_N$, of intensity $\lambda > 0$, so each resulting punctured circle $\mathbb{S}_\beta^i \setminus \mathcal{H}_i$ consists of m_i disjoint connected



Figure 1: An example of the decomposition of $\mathcal{G}_N^\beta$ after all the holes are punched and the links are drawn: $\mathcal{G}_N^\beta \setminus \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{C}_1 \vee \mathcal{C}_2 \vee \mathcal{C}_3$, where $\mathcal{C}_1 = I_1^1 \cup I_2^2 \cup I_3^1 \cup I_4^1 \cup I_4^2$, $\mathcal{C}_2 = I_2^1$ and $\mathcal{C}_3 = I_4^3$.

intervals

$$\mathbb{S}_\beta^i \setminus \mathcal{H}_i = \bigcup_{l=1}^{m_i} I_i^l \tag{1.1}$$

(the number of holes $\#\mathcal{H}_i = m_i$, except when $\#\mathcal{H}_i = 0$, in which case $m_i = 1$). We next add links between pairs of points in $\mathcal{G}_N^\beta$ of the same time coordinates (i.e. between points (i,t) and (j,t) where $i \neq j$ and $t \in \mathbb{S}_\beta$), as follows. With each (unordered) pair of sites $i, j \in G_N$ we associate a copy $\mathbb{S}_\beta^{i,j}$ of $\mathbb{S}_\beta$ and a Poisson point process of links $\mathcal{L}_{i,j}$ on $\mathbb{S}_\beta^{i,j}$ with intensity $\frac{1}{N}$. The processes $\mathcal{L}_{i,j} = \mathcal{L}_{j,i}$ are assumed to be independent for different (i,j) and also independent of the processes of holes $\mathcal{H}_i$. Two intervals I_i^l and I_j^k of the decomposition (1.1) are then considered to be directly connected if there exists some $t \in \mathcal{L}_{i,j}$ such that both $(i,t) \in I_i^l$ and $(j,t) \in I_j^k$. Setting $\mathcal{H} := \cup_i \mathcal{H}_i$ (a *finite* collection of points), the decomposition

$$\mathcal{G}_N^\beta \setminus \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{C}_1 \vee \cdots \vee \mathcal{C}_\ell \tag{1.2}$$

of $\mathcal{G}_N^\beta \setminus \mathcal{H}$ into maximal connected components is, thereby, well defined (see Figure 1 for an example with $N = 4$). Further, each fixed $x \in \mathcal{G}_N^\beta$ is a.s. not in $\mathcal{H}$, hence the notion of the connected component $\mathcal{C}(x)$ containing x in the decomposition (1.2), is also well defined, and hereafter the *size* of a connected component $\mathcal{C}_j$ (or $\mathcal{C}(x)$), means the number of intervals it contains.

Remark 1.1 *For $\lambda = 0$ there are no holes, so each $\mathbb{S}_\beta^i \setminus \mathcal{H}_i$ consists of one connected*

component, which equals to $\mathbb{S}^i_\beta$ itself. We are then back to the Erdős-Rényi random graph $G(N,p)$ with $p = 1 - e^{-\frac{\beta}{N}}$ (the probability that $\mathbb{S}^i_\beta$ and $\mathbb{S}^j_\beta$ are directly connected).

Treating each interval I^k_i as a vertex, Janson in [14] notices that the QRG is an instance of the general in-homogeneous model of [6]. However, the probability of direct connection between two intervals depends on the size of their overlap and not only on the individual lengths of these intervals. Beyond separating our model from the class of rank-1 models, this property makes it inherently different from the other models we have mentioned thus far (all of whom mimic the idea of rank-1 random graphs, in the sense that certain *vertex related weights* determine the probabilities in which edges are present in the graph).

An equivalent description of the QRG in case $\lambda > 0$, which we adopt hereafter, has N circles of length $\theta \triangleq \lambda\beta$ with a unit intensity Poisson process of holes on them, using now i.i.d. Poisson processes of intensity $1/(\lambda N)$ for creating links between each pair of (punched) circles. The critical curve for the QRG model in the (β,λ)-parameter space, is obtained in [13] by comparisons with a critical branching process whose offspring distribution is the *cut-gamma* distribution $\Gamma_\theta(2,1)$ (namely, the law of $J := (U+V)\wedge\theta$ for U,V i.i.d. Exp(1) variables). Using the preceding parametrization, the resulting curve $\beta = \beta_c(\lambda)$ corresponds to

$$\beta_c = \frac{\theta}{F(\theta)}, \quad \lambda = F(\theta), \quad \text{for} \quad F(\theta) = 2(1-e^{-\theta}) - \theta e^{-\theta} \tag{1.3}$$

(where $F(\theta)$ is precisely the expected length J of the interval I in the QRG upon our rescaling by λ). It is easy to check that $\lambda(\theta) : [0,\infty) \mapsto [0,2)$ is concave, increasing and $\beta_c(\theta) : [0,\infty) \mapsto [1,\infty)$ is strictly increasing, such that the curve $\beta_c(\lambda) : [0,2) \mapsto [1,\infty)$ is strictly increasing. The critical curve is alternatively given by

$$F(\beta,\lambda) := \lambda^{-1} F(\lambda\beta) = 1\,, \tag{1.4}$$

and it is further shown in [13] that taking $F(\beta,\lambda) > 1$ (or equivalently, $\beta > \beta_c(\lambda)$), yields the emergence of an $\Theta(N)$-giant connected component in the disjoint decomposition (1.2), whereas when $F(\beta,\lambda) < 1$ (equivalently, $\beta < \beta_c(\lambda)$), all connected components are typically of order $\mathrm{O}(\ln N)$. Our first result complements [13] by proving that at criticality the largest component is of size $\Theta(N^{2/3})$ (so the QRG admits a version of the Erdős-Rényi phase transition).

Theorem 1.2 *Suppose (β,λ) is a critical point, namely $F(\beta,\lambda) = 1$. Then, for the largest component $\mathcal{C}_{\max}$ of the QRG, we have that:*

(a) There exist c_*, N_0 and A_0 finite, such that for all $N > N_0$ and $A > A_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\mathcal{C}_{\max}| > AN^{2/3}\right) \le c_* A^{-3/2}. \tag{1.5}$$

(b) There exists N_1 finite such that for all $N > N_1$ and $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\mathcal{C}_{\max}| < \lfloor \delta N^{2/3} \rfloor\right) \le (6 + 4\beta^2)\delta^{3/5}. \tag{1.6}$$

Our primary objective is to further analyze the QRG model, and in particular its component sizes near criticality, thereby confirming that the QRG is in the same universality class as the Erdős-Rényi random graph. Whereas our proofs also rely on an exploration process for estimating the connected components sizes, in contrast to all cases dealt with before (i.e. [2, 3, 15, 20, 21]), here we may have many intervals sharing the same vertex (that is, a site $i \in G_N$, or alternatively, the corresponding circle $\mathbb{S}^i_\theta$). Thus, our exploration process (or breadth first walk), may re-visit an already visited vertex (circle), as many times as the number of intervals sharing such vertex. The latter is an *unbounded* random variable, thereby posing a serious challenge to our analysis. While Theorem 1.2 is rough enough that we can surpass this difficulty by showing that multiple returns to same vertex are rare enough to not matter, this is no longer true for our main result, Theorem 1.3, about the scaling limits of ordered component sizes. Indeed, our limiting process drift differs from that of [2] by additional quadratic factor $\gamma(\lambda\beta)\big(1-\frac{1}{\beta}\big)$, representing the already explored portion of the relevant circle. Indeed, the question of convergence of such quantum random graphs, as metric spaces, is completely open due to this precise problem of multiple visits to the same vertex.

The following quantities are required for our main result. First, let $\widehat{F}(x) = 2 - \frac{2}{x}(1-e^{-x})$ and

$$\sigma^2 = \mathbb{E}[(J/\lambda)] + \mathrm{var}(J/\lambda) =: F_2(\beta,\lambda)\,, \qquad \gamma(\theta) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{F}(\theta - J)]}{F(\theta)}\,. \tag{1.7}$$

Then, for standard Brownian motion $\{W(s), s \geq 0\}$ and any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, consider the process

$$W^{a,\beta,\sigma}(s) := \sigma W(s) + \rho^{a,\beta}(s)\,, \quad \text{for} \quad \rho^{a,\beta}(s) = as - \frac{s^2}{2}\Big(1 + \gamma(\lambda\beta)\big(1-\frac{1}{\beta}\big)\Big) \tag{1.8}$$

and the associated process of non-negative excursions

$$B^{a,\beta,\sigma}(s) = W^{a,\beta,\sigma}(s) - \min_{0\leq u\leq s} W^{a,\beta,\sigma}(u). \tag{1.9}$$

Theorem 1.3 *Fix $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and (β,λ) a point on the critical curve of (1.4). Consider parameters $(\beta_N,\lambda_N) \to (\beta,\lambda)$ such that $F(\beta_N,\lambda_N) = 1 + aN^{-1/3}$. Then, denoting the ordered sizes of components of the graph by $\mathcal{C}_1^{a,N}, \mathcal{C}_2^{a,N}, \ldots$, we have when $N \to \infty$ that*

$$(N^{-2/3}\mathcal{C}_1^{a,N}, N^{-2/3}\mathcal{C}_2^{a,N}, \ldots) \overset{d}{\Rightarrow} (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \ldots)\,,$$

where $\{\gamma_j\}$ denote the ordered lengths of the excursions of the process $B^{a,\beta,\sigma}$ above zero, and the convergence of component sizes holds with respect to the $l^2_\searrow$ topology (as defined in [2]).

In Section 2 we prove Theorem 1.2 by adapting to our context the ideas set forth in [20]. Specifically, the main task here is to construct a pair of manageable auxiliary counting processes, which are not too far apart, while stochastically dominating (from above and below, respectively), the counting process that determines the size of our components (thereby circumventing much of the difficulty associated with the precise counting).

Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.3 which requires finer estimates and thereby some new ideas. What sets our analysis apart of all those mentioned before, is Proposition

3.4 which provides rough estimates on the number of sites of QRG visited twice, or more, during the first $k = \mathrm{O}(N^{2/3})$ steps of the exploration process. It shows in particular that only the *first return to a site* plays a crucial role, with subsequent returns playing no role when the relevant limit is considered. Combined with further rough estimate on the number of sites visited exactly once during the first k steps, it thus allows us to thereafter adapt the program of [2] to the QRG setting. Specifically, Subsection 3.1 deals with weak convergence of the law induced by the rescaled breadth first walk to the law of $W^{a,\beta}$ defined on the space of RCLL functions $D([0,\infty))$, equipped with the topology of uniform convergence on finite intervals. Finally, in Subsection 3.2 we collate all the above results into a proof of Theorem 1.3.

A further insight gained from our proof is that the QRG model is in the Erdös-Rényi universality class by the confluence of two reasons: first the small probability of many returns to the same vertex (circle); second and more crucial is the relatively fast relaxation of its exploration process, which thereby behaves approximately as a Markov process. One may examine the latter feature in many other inhomogeneous random graph models, and where it is present, proceed to try proving that they too belong to the Erdös-Rényi universality class.

Acknowledgement. This work benefited from helpful discussions of A.L. with Omer Angel and from the hosting of A. L. and A. D. by the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute (as part of its program on random spatial processes). The authors would also like to thank Júlia Komjáthy for useful comments.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.2

To bypass the problem of multiple visits of the same vertex by our exploration process (as described in Subsection 2.1), we stochastically sandwich it between the over-counting process of Subsection 2.2, and the under-counting process of Subsection 2.3. By combining the upper and lower bounds provided by these two auxiliary processes, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.2.

2.1 Exploration process

Taking advantage of conditional independence properties of Poisson processes, we start with an algorithmic definition of the exploration process for our model (following [13], who used it for examining a single component). This algorithm allows us to sequentially construct (or sample), the rescaled QRG, interval by interval. In this description, our vertices (circles) have first been labeled $\{1, 2 \ldots, N\}$, and after k steps of the algorithm, we fully explored k intervals, having $A_k \geq 0$ active points (unexplored ends of connections with the already explored intervals, or the point around which a new component starts), while the rest of the space is declared to be neutral (note that we start exploring a new component of the graph upon arriving at $A_{k-1} = 0$, but not before).

Initial stage: We fix the vertex $w = 1$ and choose a point t uniformly at random on this vertex. At end of step $k = 0$ we have $A_0 = 1$, with (w, t) as our sole active point and the whole space considered neutral.

At step $k \geq 1$***:***

(a) If $A_{k-1} > 0$ we choose an active point (w, t) whose vertex has the smallest index among all active points. In case of a tie, choose the active point which chronologically appeared earlier than the others on the same vertex.

(b) If $A_{k-1} = 0$ and there exists at least one neutral circle, we choose w to be the neutral vertex with the smallest index and uniformly at random mark a new active point (w, t) on this vertex.

(c) If $A_{k-1} = 0$ and there is no neutral circle, we choose w to be the vertex of smallest index among the vertices having some neutral part, marking new active point (w, t) uniformly at random on the neutral part of $\mathbb{S}^w_\theta$.

Using i.i.d. Exp(1) variables U, V, we carve out of the maximal neutral interval $\{w\} \times (t_1, t_2)$ around (w, t) the sub-interval $I_k := \{w\} \times \widetilde{I}$ for $\widetilde{I} = (t_1 \vee (t - V), t_2 \wedge (t + U))$. For $\mathbb{S}^w_\theta$ completely neutral we take $t_2 = -t_1 = \infty$ and $\widetilde{I} = \mathbb{S}_\theta$ whenever $U + V \geq \theta$ (resulting with the length of $\widetilde{I}$ having the $\Gamma_\theta(2, 1)$ law). We then remove from the list of active points all those points which got encompassed by the interval I_k. The links in the graph connected to all such points other than (w, t), are considered to be surplus edges.

Connections of I_k*:* With $I_k = \{w\} \times \widetilde{I}_k$, for each $i \neq w$ we view $\widetilde{I}_k$ as a subset of $\mathbb{S}^{w,i}$ and sequentially for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$, sample the process of links $\mathcal{L}_{w,i}$ for $t' \geq 0$ restricted to $\widetilde{I}_k$. We erase all links between I_k and points on already explored intervals, and register each link end (i, t') on the neutral space as an active point, labeled with the time (order) of its registration.

When done exploring all the connections from I_k, we change its status from neutral to that of an explored interval and increase k by one, continuing with this procedure till no neutral space remains (which happens after finitely many steps, since the number of intervals in the QRG is finite). To recover the resulting QRG we need only to keep track of the explored intervals (end-points), and the ζ_k new links that have been formed in each step.

Now, let $\eta_k = \zeta_k - (\mathrm{sur}(k) - \mathrm{sur}(k-1))$, where sur(k) count the surplus edges found by the end of step k of exploration. Then, by definition

$$A_k = \begin{cases} A_{k-1} + \eta_k - 1, & \text{if } A_{k-1} > 0 \\ \eta_k, & \text{if } A_{k-1} = 0\,. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

As mentioned before, the exploration of the first component containing the point $(1, t)$ sampled at the initial stage ends at $\tau_1 = \min\{k \geq 1 : A_k = 0\}$, with its size $|\mathcal{C}(1, t)|$ being τ_1 (the number of explored intervals thus far). A new component whose size is $\tau_2 - \tau_1$ is then explored from step τ_1 till the end of step $\tau_2 = \min\{k > \tau_1 : A_k = 0\}$, and so on.

2.2 Overcounting

Let $m_i^{(T)} \le m_i$ count the intervals in vertex i which belong to components of $\mathcal{G}_N^\beta$ whose sizes exceed T and $\mathcal{C}(i,*)$ denotes the connected component of $\mathcal{G}_N^\beta$ containing $\mathbb{S}_\theta^i$, *after erasing* all the holes punched in $\mathbb{S}_\theta^i$ by $\mathcal{H}_i$. Since the size of the component containing interval I_i^l of (1.1) is at most $|\mathcal{C}(i,*)| + m_i - 1$, it follows that $m_i^{(2T)} = 0$ whenever both $m_i \le T$ and $|\mathcal{C}(i,*)| \le T$. Hence, by Markov's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(|\mathcal{C}_{\max}| \ge 2T\right) &\le \mathbb{P}\big(\sum_{i=1}^N m_i^{(2T)} \ge 2T\big) \\ &\le \frac{1}{2T}\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[m_i^{(2T)}] \le \frac{1}{2T}\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}\Big[m_i(\mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{C}(i,*)|>T} + \mathbf{1}_{m_i>T})\Big]\,.\end{aligned}$$

Further, $|\mathcal{C}(i,*)|$, $i \in G_N$, are identically distributed random variables, each of which is independent of the corresponding variable m_i which in turn has the Poisson$(\theta) \vee 1$ distribution. Consequently,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\mathcal{C}_{\max}| \ge 2T\right) \le \frac{N(\theta + \mathrm{e}^{-\theta})}{2T}\Big[\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(1,*)| > T) + \mathbb{P}(m_1 \ge T)\Big]\,. \tag{2.2}$$

Taking $T = (A/2)N^{2/3} = H^2$ we thus establish part (a) of Theorem 1.2, upon showing that for some c finite and all H and N large enough

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(1,*)| > H^2) \le \frac{c}{H}\,. \tag{2.3}$$

Since $\mathcal{C}(1,*)$ corresponds to the exploration process starting at $I_1 = \{1\} \times \mathbb{S}_\theta$ it suffices to consider the value of τ_1 when the corresponding $\{\eta_k\}_{k\ge1}$ are replaced in (2.1) by another, simpler to analyze, collection $\{\xi_k\}$ that stochastically dominate them. To this end, note that each η_k is bounded by the total number of links ζ_k between I_k and the neutral part of the space after I_k is selected, whereas given the whole history of the algorithm up to that point, ζ_k is bounded by the independent Poisson$(|\widetilde{I}_k|/\lambda)$ variable ξ_k that would have applied if the whole space remained neutral. Note that $|\widetilde{I}_1| = \theta$, and further the collection $\{|\widetilde{I}_k|\}$ for $k \ge 2$ is stochastically dominated by the i.i.d. $\Gamma_\theta(2,1)$-distributed $\{J_k\}$ that correspond to length of active intervals carved from neutral circles. In conclusion, (2.3) follows from the bound

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau > H^2\right) \le \frac{c}{H}\,, \tag{2.4}$$

for the time of first return to zero $\tau = \min\{n \ge 1 : S_n = 0\}$, by the random walk

$$S_n = S_1 + \sum_{k=2}^n (\xi_k - 1)\,, \tag{2.5}$$

with i.i.d. (ξ_k, J_k), such that each ξ_k follows a Poisson(J_k/λ), independently of the Poisson(β) variable S_1. Having $\{-1, 0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$-valued increments, recall Kemperman's formula for such a random walk, stating that for any $\ell \ge 0$ and $n \ge 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau = n+1 | S_1 = \ell) = \frac{\ell}{n}\mathbb{P}(\,S_{n+1} = 0|\,S_1 = \ell)$$

(see [10, Theorem 7, p.165]). Then, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\tau = n+1) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{n} \frac{\ell}{n} \mathbb{P}(S_{n+1} - S_1 = -\ell)\mathbb{P}(S_1 = \ell) \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(S_1)}{n} \sup_{\ell}\{\mathbb{P}(S_{n+1} - S_1 = -\ell)\}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Our assumption that $F(\beta, \lambda) = 1$ implies that $\mathbb{E}\xi_2 = \lambda^{-1}\mathbb{E}J_2 = 1$ so $\{S_n\}_{n\geq 2}$ has zero-mean i.i.d. increments of finite exponential tails. Thus, applying the local CLT for the lattice random walk $S_{n+1} - S_1$ (see [16, Ch.2.]), we deduce from (2.6) that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau = n+1) \leq cn^{-3/2}\,, \tag{2.7}$$

for some c finite and all n, which results with (2.4).

2.3 Undercounting

To bound the lower tail of $|\mathcal{C}_{\max}|$, we stochastically bound below all component sizes by following a more restrictive exploration process, which after forming the first active point on each vertex $w \in G_N$, voids all space on that same vertex beyond the relevant interval around this active point (thus sequentially producing components with no more intervals than does the original exploration process). Specifically, after the initial stage, at each step $k \geq 1$ the restrictive exploration considers for I_k only active intervals or completely neutral circles (as in parts (a) and (b) of the original exploration process), till none such are left. It also keeps at most one connection from I_k to any as of yet never visited (in particular, completely neutral) circle $\mathbb{S}^i_\theta$, ignoring (erasing) all the other links which are being formed in step k by the original exploration process. Note that this restrictive process has no surplus edges and its number of active points A^f_k, starts at $A^f_0 = 1$ and follows the recursion

$$A^f_k = \begin{cases} A^f_{k-1} + \eta^f_k - 1, & \text{if } A^f_{k-1} > 0 \\ \eta^f_k, & \text{if } A^f_{k-1} = 0\,. \end{cases} \tag{2.8}$$

Here $\eta^f_k = \zeta^f_k$ are conditionally on A^f_{k-1} independent $\mathrm{Bin}(N^f_{k-1}, 1 - e^{-J_k/(\lambda N)})$ variables for i.i.d. $\Gamma_\theta(2,1)$-distributed $\{J_k\}$ and $N^f_k := N - k - (A^f_k \vee 1)$. As before the component sizes are given by $\tau^f_r - \tau^f_{r-1}$, for successive returns to zero $\tau^f_r = \min\{k > \tau^f_{r-1} : A^f_k = 0\}$, starting at $\tau^f_0 = 0$.

Had we replaced J_k by $\mathbb{E}J_k = \lambda$, it would have resulted in the exploration process for the (effectively) critical Erdős-Rényi random graph $G(N, 1 - e^{-1/N})$, for which (1.6) is well-known, for example, see [20, Theorem 2]. As we are not aware of a study of component sizes for our in-homogeneous graph, we next adapt the proof of [20, Theorem 2] to our context.

First, from the recursion (2.8) if $A^f_{k-1} > 0$, then

$$(A^f_k)^2 - (A^f_{k-1})^2 = (\eta^f_k - 1)^2 + 2(\eta^f_k - 1)A^f_{k-1}.$$

Recall that $\mathbb{E}[J_k] = \lambda$, so assuming $0 < A^f_{k-1} \leq h$ we get that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(A_k^f)^2 - (A_{k-1}^f)^2 \middle| A_{k-1}^f\right] \geq \frac{(N-h-k)^2}{(\lambda N)^2}\mathbb{E}[J_k^2] - 2\frac{h}{N}(h+k) + \mathrm{O}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right). \tag{2.9}$$

Further, $\mathbb{E}[J_k^2] > \lambda^2$, so for $h = c_h N^{1/3}$, large enough N and all $k \leq T_h = c_1 N^{2/3}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(A_k^f)^2 - (A_{k-1}^f)^2 \middle| A_{k-1}^f\right] \geq 1 - 2c_h c_1 . \tag{2.10}$$

The latter bound applies also when $A_{k-1}^f = 0$ (as then $A_k^f = \eta_k^f$). Now, taking $b := 1 - 2c_h c_1 > 0$, we consider the stopping time

$$\tau_h = T_h \wedge \min\{k \geq 0 : A_k^f \geq h\}$$

noting that by the preceding calculation, $L_k := (A_{k\wedge\tau_h}^f)^2 - b(k \wedge \tau_h)$ is a sub-martingale starting at $L_0 = 1$. Further, it is shown in [20, Proof of Lemma 5] that for ξ a $\mathrm{Bin}(n,p)$ variable, any $n \leq N$, given $\xi \geq r$ the distribution of $\xi - r$ is stochastically dominated by $\mathrm{Bin}(N,p)$. Thus, given $\tau_h = k \leq T_h$, $N_{k-1}^f = n \leq N$, $A_{k-1}^f = \ell$ and $p = 1 - e^{-J_k/(\lambda N)}$ we have that conditioned on $A_k^f \geq h$, the distribution of $A_k^f - h$ is stochastically dominated by $\mathrm{Bin}(N,p)$. Averaging over all possible n, k, ℓ, p values, we deduce that conditioned on $\{A_{\tau_h}^f \geq h\}$ the over shoot $(A_{\tau_h}^f - h)$ is stochastically dominated by $\mathrm{Bin}(N, p_N)$ for independent $p_N = 1 - e^{-J/(\lambda N)}$ with $J \sim \Gamma_\theta(2,1)$. Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}[(A_{\tau_h}^f)^2] \leq h^2 + 2h\mathbb{E}[Np_N] + \mathbb{E}[(Np_N)^2] + \mathbb{E}[Np_N(1-p_N)] \leq (h+2)^2 ,$$

for $h = c_h N^{1/3}$ and all N large enough. With $\tau_h \leq T_h$, upon applying the optional stopping theorem for the L^2-bounded sub-martingale $\{L_k\}$, we find that $\mathbb{E}[(A_{\tau_h}^f)^2] \geq 1 + b\mathbb{E}(\tau_h)$. Thus, by Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_h = T_h) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\tau_h]}{T_h} \leq \frac{(h+2)^2}{bT_h} = \frac{c_h^2}{bc_1}(1 + o(1)) . \tag{2.11}$$

Fixing $T_0 = \delta N^{2/3}$ note that $|\mathcal{C}_{\max}|$ exceeds the value of the stopping time

$$\tau_0 = T_0 \wedge \min\{s \geq 0 : A_{\tau_h+s}^f = 0\} ,$$

so the stated bound (1.6) follows once we show that for any $b' > \lambda^{-2}\mathbb{E}[J^2] + 2c_h(c_1 + \delta)$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau_0 < T_0 \,|\, A_{\tau_h}^f \geq h\right) \leq \frac{b'\delta}{c_h^2} . \tag{2.12}$$

Indeed, we then choose $c_h = \frac{1}{2}\delta^{1/5}$ and $c_1 = 1/(4c_h)$, so $b = 1/2$ and $b' = \beta^2 + 1$ works whenever $\delta \leq 1/2$.

To derive (2.12) consider the uniformly bounded, non-negative process $M_k = \max\{h - A_{\tau_h+k}^f, 0\}$. If $0 < M_{k-1} < h$ then by (2.8)

$$M_k^2 - M_{k-1}^2 \leq \left(\eta_{\tau_h+k}^f - 1\right)^2 + 2\left(1 - \eta_{\tau_h+k}^f\right) M_{k-1} .$$

The same inequality applies when $M_{k-1}=0$ (i.e. $A^f_{\tau_h+k-1}\geq h$, so $M_k\leq \max\{1-\eta^f_{\tau_h+k},0\}$). By definition, $A^f_{\tau_h+k-1}\leq h$ whenever $M_{k-1}\neq 0$, hence for N large enough and all $k\leq T_0$, $\tau_h\leq T_h$ we find, as in the derivation of (2.10) that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[M_k^2-M_{k-1}^2\,|\,M_{k-1}<h\Big]\leq \lambda^{-2}\mathbb{E}[J^2]+2\frac{h}{N}(T_h+T_0+h)+o(1)\leq b'\,.$$

Thus, conditioned on the event $A^f_{\tau_h}\geq h$ the process $\{M^2_{k\wedge\tau_0}-b'(k\wedge\tau_0)\}$ is a super-martingale which starts at zero. Noting that $\{\tau_0<T_0\}\subseteq\{M_{\tau_0}=h\}$, upon applying the optional stopping theorem for this process at τ_0, we conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau_0<T_0\,|\,A^f_{\tau_h}\geq h\right)\leq h^{-2}\mathbb{E}\big[M^2_{\tau_0}\,|\,A^f_{\tau_h}\geq h\big]\leq b'h^{-2}\mathbb{E}[\tau_0\,|\,A^f_{\tau_h}\geq h]\leq b'\frac{T_0}{h^2}\,,$$

as stated.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.3

3.1 Exploration process and Brownian excursions

Recall the length of a sampled interval of the QRG being $J=\min(U+V,\theta)$ for i.i.d. standard Exponential variables U,V (a distribution we denote by $\Gamma_\theta(2,1)$). With $\mathbb{E}(J)=F(\theta)$ of (1.3), the critical curve has the explicit expression $\lambda=F(\theta)$. Further, the critical window around some $\lambda_\star=F(\theta_\star)$ for $\theta_\star>0$, corresponds to fixing $a\in\mathbb{R}$ and considering

$$\theta_N\to\theta_\star\,,\qquad F(\theta_N)=\lambda_N\big(1+aN^{-1/3}\big)\,. \tag{3.1}$$

Let $\widetilde{N}=\sum_{i=1}^N m_i$ denote the total number of steps in the exploration process of Subsection 2.1, and $(Y_N^{a,\theta_N}(k),k\leq\widetilde{N})$ be the breadth-first walk associated with the QRG on $\mathcal{G}^N_{\theta_N}$, where (θ_N,λ_N) satisfy (3.1). That is,

$$Y_N^{a,\theta_N}(k)=Y_N^{a,\theta_N}(k-1)+\eta_k-1,\qquad Y_N^{a,\theta_N}(0)=1, \tag{3.2}$$

for η_k of recursion (2.1). Thus, $Y_N^{a,\theta_N}(k)$ (which may well become negative as k grows), counts the number of active points at the end of step k, minus the number of completely explored components before step k. Setting

$$\beta_\star=\frac{\theta_\star}{\lambda_\star}\,,\qquad \sigma_\star^2=F_2(\beta_\star,\lambda_\star)=\frac{1}{\lambda_*^2}\mathbb{E}\Big[\big((U+V)\wedge\theta_\star\big)^2\Big]\,, \tag{3.3}$$

our goal in this subsection is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1 *For (θ_N,λ_N) that satisfy (3.1), as $N\to\infty$, the processes*

$$\bar{Y}_N^{a,\theta_N}(s)=N^{-1/3}Y_N^{a,\theta_N}(\lfloor N^{2/3}s\rfloor\wedge\widetilde{N})\,, \tag{3.4}$$

converge in law to $W^{a,\beta_\star,\sigma_\star}$ of (1.8) (on the space $D([0,\infty))$ equipped with the topology of uniform convergence on compacts).

Recall that ζ_k links are generated at step k of the exploration process and let

$$Z_N^{a,\theta_N}(l) = Z_N^{a,\theta_N}(l-1) + \zeta_l - 1\,, \qquad Z_N^{a,\theta_N}(0) = 1, \tag{3.5}$$

be the corresponding breadth-first walk. Since we sample intervals only when they are to be explored, the walk Z_N does not distinguish between active points that end as intervals of the QRG and those that are later found to be on surplus edges. Nevertheless, our next proposition controls the number of active points, which as seen in Remark 3.3, yields having at most $\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ surplus edges till step $sN^{2/3}$.

Proposition 3.2 *Fixing a, recall the count A_k of active points at the end of step k of the exploration for (θ_N, λ_N) satisfying (3.1). Then, for some $K = K(a,s) < \infty$ and all $L, N \geq L_0(a,s)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(N^{-1/3} \max_{k \leq sN^{2/3}} \{A_k\} > L \right) \leq KL^{-2}\,. \tag{3.6}$$

Remark 3.3 *Recall $sur(l)$ counting the surplus links detected in part (a) of the exploration process during its first l steps. The order of exploring active points is such that the first active point formed on any given vertex never contributes to $sur(l)$. Hence, conditional on the state of the process at the start of its k-th step, the number of active points registered during that step that contribute to any future $sur(l)$, is stochastically dominated by a Poisson$(A_{k-1}\theta_N(\lambda_N, N)^{-1})$ random variable. In particular, for some κ finite and all N, l,*

$$\mathbb{E}[sur(l)] \leq \frac{\kappa}{N}\mathbb{E}\big[\sum_{k=0}^{l-1} A_k\big] \leq \frac{\kappa l}{N}\mathbb{E}\big[\max_{k \leq l}\{A_k\}\big]\,. \tag{3.7}$$

From Proposition 3.6 we thus have that $\mathbb{E}[sur(sN^{2/3})]$ is uniformly bounded in N.

Proof. With $Y_N = Y_N^{a,\theta_N}$, $Z_N = Z_N^{a,\theta_N}$ and $\iota(l)$ the number of components in the corresponding graph completely explored before step l, we use the relations

$$A_l = Y_N(l) + \iota(l) = Z_N(l) - \mathrm{sur}(l) + \iota(l)\,, \tag{3.8}$$

$$\iota(l) = 1 - \min_{0 \leq k \leq (l-1)} \{Z_N(k) - \mathrm{sur}(k)\}\,, \tag{3.9}$$

and the fact that $k \mapsto \mathrm{sur}(k)$ is non-decreasing, to find that

$$A_l = 1 + Z_N(l) - \mathrm{sur}(l) + \max_{k \leq (l-1)} \{\mathrm{sur}(k) - Z_N(k)\} \leq 1 + \max_{k \leq l}\{Z_N(l) - Z_N(k)\}.$$

It thus suffices to prove (3.6) with $Z_N^+(k) := Z_N(k) - \min_{j \leq k}\{Z_N(j)\}$ instead of A_k. To this end, consider the random walk $\{S_n\}$ of (2.5) for $S_1 = \xi_1$ and the i.i.d. (ξ_k, J_k), such that ξ_k is Poisson$(\lambda_N^{-1} J_k)$ and J_k has the law of $\Gamma_{\theta_N}(2,1)$. Recall Section 2.2, that the variables (ζ_k) are stochastically dominated by (ξ_k) and consequently, the sequence $Z_N^+(l)$ is stochastically dominated by $S_l^+ := S_l - \min_{j \leq l}\{S_j\}$. With $\mathbb{E}\xi_1 = 1 + a\,N^{-1/3}$ due to (3.1), $S_k = M_k + a\,k\,N^{-1/3}$, for the martingale $\{M_k\}$ whose i.i.d. increments have uniformly (in N), bounded second moment. Thus, controlling the tail of $N^{-1/3}\max_{k \leq s\,N^{2/3}} |M_k|$ by

Doob's L^2-maximal inequality, establishes (3.6) for $|M_k|$ and thereby for M_k^+, S_k^+, $Z_N^+(k)$ and A_k. □

The control on the number of vertices which the exploration process visits at least twice by the end of the k-th step (for $k = sN^{2/3}$), is crucial for the success of our analysis. To this end, we define hereafter *the number of visits to vertex $v \in G_N$ by the end of the k-th exploration step*, as the aggregate number of active points formed on $\mathbb{S}^v_{\theta_N}$ by that time.

Proposition 3.4 *For the exploration of the* QRG *at parameters satisfying (3.1), let $\nu^l_{\geq m}$ count the total number of visits by the end of its l-th step, to sites (circles), having at least m such visits each. Then, for some finite κ, all positive A, s and N large enough, we have that for $m = 1, 2, 3$ and any $l \in [1, sN^{2/3}]$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\nu^l_{\geq m} \geq Al^m N^{1-m}) \leq \frac{\kappa^m}{A}\,. \tag{3.10}$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}_t$ denote the filtration generated by the state of the exploration process of Subsection 2.1 and $\tau(v)$ the stage in which it first visits $v \in G_N$ (so $\mathcal{F}_{\tau(v)}$ records the state of the exploration process immediately after selecting its first active point on $\mathbb{S}^v_\theta$). For any $l \geq 1$ and v let $L_v(l)$ count the links made between vertices other than v and the neutral part of the circle at v till the end of the l-th step of that process, with $L'_v(l)$ counting only such links made after $\tau(v)$ (setting $L'_v(l) = 0$ in case $\tau(v) \geq l+1$). Only one interval is explored in each step, hence

$$\mathbb{E}[\nu^l_{\geq 1}] \leq l + \sum_{v=1}^N \mathbb{E}[L_v(l)]\,. \tag{3.11}$$

Note that $L_v(l)$ increases when modifying the exploration process so the l explored intervals are complete circles (of length θ_N), other than the circle at v, which remains completely neutral, even after links to it have formed. Thus, $L_v(l)$ is stochastically dominated by a Poisson variable of parameter

$$\frac{\theta_N\, l}{\lambda_N\, N} \leq \frac{\kappa' l}{N}\,, \tag{3.12}$$

for some κ' finite and all N large enough. In particular, by (3.11) $\mathbb{E}[\nu^l_{\geq 1}] \leq (\kappa'+1)l$, which in combination with Markov's inequality establishes (3.10) for $m = 1$ and any $\kappa \geq \kappa' + 1$.

Next recall that for $k \leq N$, either $A_k > 0$ so part (a) of the exploration process applies at the k-th step, or else part (b) applies for it (since at most $k-1 < N$ vertices have been explored before). Consequently, assuming hereafter that $sN^{2/3} \leq N$, part (c) of the exploration does not occur throughout its first l steps. Further, all active points chosen in part (b) or the initial stage of the process result with a *first* visit of new vertex. Hence we have in analogy with (3.11) that

$$\mathbb{E}[\nu^l_{\geq 2}\,] \leq 2\sum_{v=1}^N \mathbb{E}[L'_v(l)]\,. \tag{3.13}$$

As argued before, conditional on $\mathcal{F}_{\tau(v)}$ the value of $L'_v(l)$ increases if from time $\tau(v)$ onward we modify the process to have all explored intervals be complete circles (of length θ_N), on vertices other than v, while keeping the circle at v completely neutral. That is, conditionally

on $\mathcal{F}_{\tau(v)}$ the variable $L'_v(l)$ is stochastically dominated by a Poisson variable of parameter $\kappa' l N^{-1}$ times the indicator on the event $\{\tau(v) < l+1\}$. Hence, for any $l \geq 1$ and $v \in G_N$,

$$\mathbb{E}\big[L'_v(l) \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}_{\tau(v)}\big] \leq \Big(\frac{\kappa' l}{N}\Big)\, \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau(v)<l+1\}}\,. \tag{3.14}$$

Summing over v the expected value of (3.14), we deduce from (3.13) that

$$\mathbb{E}[\nu^l_{\geq 2}\,] \leq 2\Big(\frac{\kappa' l}{N}\Big)\,\mathbb{E}[\nu^l_{\geq 1}] \leq 2(\kappa'+1)\kappa' l^2 N^{-1} \tag{3.15}$$

from which we recover (3.10) for $m = 2$ and $\kappa = 2\kappa' + 1$ (by Markov's inequality).

Finally, repeating this argument, now with $\tau(v)$ the time at which the second active point on $v \in G_N$ is selected, we deduce that

$$\mathbb{E}[\nu^l_{\geq 3}\,] \leq 3\Big(\frac{\kappa' l}{N}\Big)\,\mathbb{E}[\nu^l_{\geq 2}\,],$$

which upon suitably increasing the value of κ, yields (3.10) for $m = 3$. □

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Equipping $D([0,\infty))$ with the topology of uniform convergence on compacts, let

$$\bar{Z}^{a,\theta_N}_N(s) = N^{-1/3} Z^{a,\theta_N}_N(\lfloor N^{2/3} s\rfloor \wedge \widetilde{N})\,, \tag{3.16}$$

for the breadth first walk $Z^{a,\theta_N}_N(\cdot)$ of (3.5). Recall that

$$\bar{Z}^{a,\theta_N}_N(s) - \bar{Y}^{a,\theta_N}_N(s) = N^{-1/3}\mathrm{sur}(\lfloor N^{2/3} s\rfloor \wedge \widetilde{N})$$

is non-decreasing in s and so by Remark 3.3, as $N \to \infty$,

$$\sup_{s\leq s_0} \Big|\bar{Z}^{a,\theta_N}_N(s) - \bar{Y}^{a,\theta_N}_N(s)\Big| \to 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{P}\,. \tag{3.17}$$

It thus suffices to prove that $\bar{Z}^{a,\theta_N}_N$ converges in law to the desired limit W^{a,β_*}. To this end, by Doob's decomposition with respect to the canonical filtration $\mathcal{F}_k$ associated with the exploration process, we get that

$$Z^{a,\theta_N}_N = M^{a,\theta_N}_N + B^{a,\theta_N}_N\,, \qquad \big(M^{a,\theta_N}_N\big)^2 = Q^{a,\theta_N}_N + D^{a,\theta_N}_N\,, \tag{3.18}$$

with martinagles M^{a,θ_N}_N, Q^{a,θ_N}_N (null at $k=0$), and predictable processes B^{a,θ_N}_N and D^{a,θ_N}_N. Adopting the notation $\bar{M}_N$, $\bar{B}_N$, in accordance with (3.16), and $\bar{Q}_N$, $\bar{D}_N$ similarly scaled by extra factor $N^{-1/3}$ in accordance to the RHS of (3.18), we show in Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6, respectively, that for $\sigma_\star$ of (3.3) and any finite s_0, as $N \to \infty$,

$$\bar{D}^{a,\theta_N}_N(s_0) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \sigma^2_\star s_0\,, \tag{3.19}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{s\leq s_0} \big|\bar{M}^{a,\theta_N}_N(s) - \bar{M}^{a,\theta_N}_N(s^-)\big|^2\Big] \to 0\,. \tag{3.20}$$

Combining (3.19) and (3.20), it then follows from [9, Theorem 7.1.4] that the martingales $\{\bar{M}^{a,\theta_N}_N\}$ converge weakly in $D([0,\infty))$ to $\sigma_\star W$ for a standard Brownian motion W. Further, we show in Proposition 3.7 that

$$\sup_{s\leq s_0} \Big|\bar{B}^{a,\theta_N}_N(s) - \rho^{a,\beta_\star}(s)\Big| \to_{\mathbb{P}} 0\,. \tag{3.21}$$

That is, the sequence of predictable processes $\bar{B}_N^{a,\theta_N}$ converges in probability in $D([0,\infty))$ to the non-random $\rho^{a,\beta_\star}$ of (1.8), hence $\bar{Z}_N^{a,\theta_N}$ converges in law to $W^{a,\beta_\star,\sigma_\star}$. □

Proceeding with the proof of (3.19)–(3.21), we often drop the indices (a,θ_N) from Z_N^{a,θ_N} and related random variables. We start by establishing (3.19). That is,

Lemma 3.5 *For (θ_N,λ_N) that satisfy (3.1), $\sigma_\star$ of (3.3), any $\delta>0$ and s_0 finite,*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\sup_{l\le N^{2/3}s_0}\mathbb{P}(|D_N^{a,\theta_N}(l)-\sigma_\star^2 l|\ge 2\delta N^{2/3})=0\,. \tag{3.22}$$

Proof. Recall that $D_N(k)-D_N(k-1)=\mathrm{var}(\zeta_k|\mathcal{F}_{k-1})$ (starting at $D_N(0)=0$). Augmenting $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ by $I_k=\{w\}\times\widetilde{I}_k$, the conditional law of ζ_k is Poisson(φ_k), with φ_k denoting the aggregate over circles other than $\mathbb{S}^w_{\theta_N}$, of the length of their neutral space restricted to $\widetilde{I}_k$ and divided by $\lambda_N N$. As such, both its conditional mean and conditional variance are given by φ_k, hence by the variance conditioning decomposition,

$$\mathrm{var}(\zeta_k|\mathcal{F}_{k-1})=\mathbb{E}[\varphi_k|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}]+\mathrm{var}[\varphi_k|\mathcal{F}_{k-1}]\,.$$

Further, at the start of the k-th step there are at least $N-k$ completely neutral circles beyond the vertex on which the k-th explored interval lies. Hence, for $J_k=|\widetilde{I}_k|$ and any $k\le s_0N^{2/3}$,

$$0\le\frac{J_k}{\lambda_N}-\varphi_k\le\frac{J_k k}{\lambda_N N}\le\kappa' N^{-1/3}$$

(for $\kappa'=s_0\sup_N\{\theta_N/\lambda_N\}$ finite). It thus suffices to prove (3.22) for $\widehat{D}_N(l)$ instead of $D_N(l)$, where

$$\widehat{D}_N(k)-\widehat{D}_N(k-1)=\mathbb{E}[J_k/\lambda_N\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{k-1}]+\mathrm{var}[J_k/\lambda_N\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{k-1}]=:\Delta_k\,.$$

The non-negative Δ_k are uniformly bounded by $\overline{\Delta}:=\sup_N\{(\theta_N/\lambda_N)+(\theta_N/\lambda_N)^2\}$. Moreover, whenever $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ dictates that the k-th step explores the first interval on a given vertex $w\in G_N$, it yields a conditionally independent J_k that follow the $\Gamma_{\theta_N}(2,1)$ distribution. We consequently have that $\Delta_k=F_2(\beta_N,\lambda_N)$ (for $F_2(\beta,\lambda)$ of (1.7)), in any such step. This applies to all but at most $\nu^l_{\ge 2}$ of the first l steps, hence

$$|\widehat{D}_N(l)-F_2(\beta_N,\lambda_N)l|\le\overline{\Delta}\,\nu^l_{\ge 2}\,.$$

From Proposition 3.4 we know that $\mathbb{P}(\nu^l_{\ge 2}\ge\delta N^{2/3})\to 0$ for $l=N^{2/3}s_0$ and we thus get (3.22) for $\widehat{D}_N(l)$ upon noting that $F_2(\beta_N,\lambda_N)\to\sigma_\star^2$ of (3.3). □

We next establish (3.20), thereby moving closer to completing the proof of Proposition 3.1.

Lemma 3.6 *For (θ_N,λ_N) that satisfy (3.1) and any s_0 finite,*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}N^{-2/3}\mathbb{E}\big[\max_{1\le l\le s_0N^{2/3}}|M_N^{a,\theta_N}(l)-M_N^{a,\theta_N}(l-1)|^2\big]=0. \tag{3.23}$$

Proof. Recall that $M_N(\cdot)$ is the martingale part of $Z_N(\cdot)$. Hence, from (3.5)

$$M_N(l)-M_N(l-1)=\zeta_l-\mathbb{E}(\zeta_l|\mathcal{F}_{l-1})$$

and (3.23) amounts to showing that

$$N^{-2/3}\mathbb{E}\big[\max_{l\le s_0N^{2/3}}\big(\zeta_l-\mathbb{E}(\zeta_l|\mathcal{F}_{l-1})\big)^2\big]\to 0.$$

Clearly, $\big(\zeta_l-\mathbb{E}(\zeta_l|\mathcal{F}_{l-1})\big)^2\le 2\zeta_l^2+2\mathbb{E}(\zeta_l|\mathcal{F}_{l-1})^2$. Further, in Section 2.2 we saw that conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_{l-1}$ the variable ζ_l is stochastically dominated by the independent $\xi_l\ge 0$ whose mean $F(\beta_N,\lambda_N)$ is uniformly bounded (in N). Hence, $\sup_l\mathbb{E}(\zeta_l|\mathcal{F}_{l-1})^2\le\sup_N F(\beta_N,\lambda_N)^2$ is finite and it suffices to show that for i.i.d. (ξ_l),

$$N^{-2/3}\mathbb{E}[\max_{l\le s_0N^{2/3}}\zeta_l^2]\le N^{-2/3}\mathbb{E}[\max_{l\le s_0N^{2/3}}\xi_l^2]\to 0\,. \tag{3.24}$$

Finally, recall [11, equation (6')] that the expected maximum of n i.i.d. variables of zero-mean and unit variance is at most $(n-1)/\sqrt{2n-1}$. Consequently, the expectation on the right side of (3.24) grows at most at rate $\mathrm{O}(N^{1/3})$, which proves (3.23) (and thereby (3.20) as well). □

For the remainder of Section 3.1 we complete the proof of Proposition 3.1 by establishing (3.21). Indeed, upon rearranging the expression (1.8) for $\rho^{a,\beta_\star}$, this is precisely the statement of our next proposition.

Proposition 3.7 *For (θ_N,λ_N) that satisfy (3.1) and any s_0 finite, as $N\to\infty$,*

$$\sup_{s\le s_0}\Big|\bar B_N^{a,\theta_N}(s)-\big(a\,s-\frac{s^2}{2}\big)+\frac{s^2}{2}\big(1-\frac{1}{\beta_\star}\big)\big(1-\gamma(\theta_\star)\big)-\frac{s^2}{2}\big(1-\frac{1}{\beta_\star}\big)\Big|\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}0\,. \tag{3.25}$$

Turning to the proof of Proposition 3.7, we first express $B_N(l)$ as the sum of the terms (3.26)-(3.28), which for $l=sN^{2/3}$ upon further scaling by $N^{-1/3}$ converge to the three limit expressions on the LHS of (3.25), respectively.

Lemma 3.8 *For (θ_N,λ_N) that satisfy (3.1), let*

$$\Theta_m^k=\{v\in G_N: v \text{ has exactly } m \text{ explored intervals after } k \text{ steps}\}\,,$$

and E_m^k denote the event that the interval $\widetilde I_{k+1}$ explored during the $(k+1)$-st step is on some vertex $w\in\Theta_m^k$. Then, for fixed s_0, all N large enough and uniformly over $l\in[1,s_0N^{2/3}]$,

$$B_N(l)=\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)-l+\frac{1}{\lambda_N N}\sum_{k=0}^{l-1}(N-k)F(\theta_N) \tag{3.26}$$

$$-\frac{1}{\lambda_N}\sum_{k=0}^{l-1}\Big(F(\theta_N)-\mathbb{E}\big(|\widetilde I_{k+1}|\big|\mathcal{F}_k\big)\Big)\mathbf{1}_{E_1^k} \tag{3.27}$$

$$+\frac{1}{\lambda_N N}\sum_{k=0}^{l-1}\mathbf{1}_{E_0^k}\sum_{v\in\Theta_1^k}\mathbb{E}\big(|\widetilde I_{k+1}\cap\widetilde I^n(v)|\big|\mathcal{F}_k\big)\,, \tag{3.28}$$

where $\widetilde I^n(v)$ denotes the neutral part of the vertex v.

Proof of Lemma 3.8. Let $\zeta_{k+1}(v)$ counts the links to $v \in G_N$ formed during the $(k+1)$ exploration step, which conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_k$, follow the Poisson distribution with parameter $|\widetilde{I}_{k+1} \cap \widetilde{I}^n(v)|/(\lambda_N N)$, bounded by the non-random $\theta_N/(\lambda_N N)$. Recalling that $B_N(l)$ is the predictable process in Doob's decomposition of $Z_N(l)$ we get from (3.5) that

$$B_N(l) = -(l-1) + \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \mathbb{E}(\zeta_{k+1}|\mathcal{F}_k) = -(l-1) + \sum_{k=0}^{l-1}\sum_{v=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}(\zeta_{k+1}(v)|\mathcal{F}_k)$$
$$= -(l-1) + \frac{1}{\lambda_N N} \sum_{k=0}^{l-1}\sum_{v=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\big(|\widetilde{I}_{k+1} \cap \widetilde{I}^n(v)| \,\big|\mathcal{F}_k\big)\,. \tag{3.29}$$

We shall re-group the sum in (3.29) over $v \in \Theta_0^k$ (yielding the terms (3.26) and (3.27)), over $v \in \Theta_1^k$ (from which we get (3.28)), and over v in the remainder of G_N, denoted hereafter by $\Theta_{\geq 2}^k$. Indeed, if $v \in \Theta_0^k$ then

$$\mathbb{E}\big(|\widetilde{I}_{k+1} \cap \widetilde{I}^n(v)| \,\big|\mathcal{F}_k\big) = \mathbb{E}\big(|\widetilde{I}_{k+1}| \,\big|\mathcal{F}_k\big)\,. \tag{3.30}$$

Further simplification occurs under the event E_0^k, in which case the RHS of (3.30) is precisely $F(\theta_N)$ (since $\widetilde{I}_{k+1}$ is the first explored interval on its vertex). In contrast, under the event E_1^k the interval $\widetilde{I}_{k+1}$ is the second to be explored on its vertex, hence the RHS of (3.30) is smaller than $F(\theta_N)$, yielding the correction term (3.27).
Now, by definition $\sum_m |\Theta_m^k| = N$ and $\sum_m m|\Theta_m^k| = k$, hence

$$|\Theta_0^k| - (N-k) = \sum_{m \geq 2} (m-1)|\Theta_m^k| \leq \nu_{\geq 2}^k\,. \tag{3.31}$$

In particular, also $|\Theta_{\geq 2}^k| \leq \nu_{\geq 2}^k$ and from Proposition 3.4 we deduce that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \Big(\big[|\Theta_0^k| - (N-k)\big]\mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{I}_{k+1}| \,|\mathcal{F}_k) + \sum_{v \in \Theta_{\geq 2}^k} \mathbb{E}\big(|\widetilde{I}_{k+1} \cap \widetilde{I}^n(v)| \,\big|\mathcal{F}_k\big)\Big) \leq 2l\theta_N \nu_{\geq 2}^l = \mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}\left(l^3 N^{-1}\right)\,,$$

so dividing both sides by $(\lambda_N N)$, this is included for $l \leq s_0 N^{2/3}$ within the $\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ term in (3.26). Three other contributions are included in that same $\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. First, by restricting to E_1^k in (3.27) we introduce a uniformly bounded (in l, N) total error in the sum over $v \in \Theta_0^k$, at each of the at most $\nu_{\geq 3}^l = \mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ steps corresponding to events $E_{\geq 2}^k$. Next, the sum (3.27) of non-negative bounded terms has at most $\nu_{\geq 2}^l$ non-zero summands. Hence by eliminating there the factors $(1 - k/N)$ we introduced only an additional error of order $(l/N)\nu_{\geq 2}^l = \mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Since $|\Theta_1^k| \leq l$ and $E_{\geq 1}^k$ occurs for at most $\nu_{\geq 2}^l$ values of $k < l$, our restriction of the sum (3.28) to steps in which E_0^k holds, introduced yet another error of order at most $(l/N)\nu_{\geq 2}^l = \mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Since all error terms are non-decreasing in l, the $\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ we obtain for $l = s_0 N^{2/3}$, also applies for smaller l. □

Proof of Proposition 3.7. Plugging $F(\theta_N) = \lambda_N \left(1 + a\, N^{-1/3}\right)$, we find that the RHS of (3.26) is

$$\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1) - l + (1 + a\, N^{-1/3})(l - \frac{l^2}{2N})\,,$$

which upon setting $l = sN^{2/3}$ and scaling by $N^{-1/3}$, converges to $(as - \frac{s^2}{2})$ when $N \to \infty$, uniformly over $s \le s_0$. We complete the proof of the proposition by way of Lemmas 3.9 and 3.10, which show that upon scaling by $N^{-1/3}$, for $l = sN^{2/3}$ the terms in (3.28) and (3.27) converge in probability as $N \to \infty$, uniformly over $s \le s_0$, to the appropriate non-random limits, respectively. Indeed, by the preceding we conclude that the processes $s \mapsto \bar{B}_N(s)$ converge to the deterministic path $s \mapsto \rho^{a,\beta_\star}(s)$ of (1.8), uniformly over $s \le s_0$. □

Lemma 3.9 *For (θ_N, λ_N) satisfying (3.1), under the notations of Lemma 3.8 we have that uniformly over $s \le s_0$,*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_N N^{4/3}} \sum_{k=0}^{s N^{2/3}-1} \mathbf{1}_{E_0^k} \sum_{v\in\Theta_1^k} \mathbb{E}(|\tilde{I}_{k+1} \cap \tilde{I}^n(v)| \big| \mathcal{F}_k) = \frac{s^2}{2}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{\beta_\star}\Big) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{P}. \tag{3.32}$$

Lemma 3.10 *In the setting of Lemmas 3.8 and 3.9, uniformly over $s \le s_0$,*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_N N^{1/3}} \sum_{k=0}^{sN^{2/3}-1} \Big(F(\theta_N) - \mathbb{E}\big(|\widetilde{I}_{k+1}| \big| \mathcal{F}_k\big)\Big) \mathbf{1}_{E_1^k} = \frac{s^2}{2}\big(1 - \frac{1}{\beta_\star}\big)\big(1 - \gamma(\theta_\star)\big) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{P}. \tag{3.33}$$

Remark 3.11 *Recall that for two arcs $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{I}'$ in $\mathbb{S}_\theta$ of uniformly chosen relative shift U, the expected length of $(\mathcal{I}'+U)\cap\mathcal{I}$ is the product of arc lengths divided by θ. For i.i.d. $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{I}'$ of length $\Gamma_\theta(2,1)$ we thus get that $\mathbb{E}[|(\mathcal{I}'+U)\cap\mathcal{I}|] = F(\theta)^2/\theta$, which at $\lambda_\star = F(\theta_\star)$ equals $\lambda_\star/\beta_\star$. The heuristic behind (3.32) is thus that $|\Theta_1^k| = k(1+o(1))$ for large k and further, for most $v \in \Theta_1^k$ the complement in $\mathbb{S}_{\theta_N}$ of $\widetilde{I}^n(v)$ and the interval $\widetilde{I}_{k+1}$ can be well approximated by such i.i.d. pair of intervals $(\mathcal{I}'+U)$ and $\mathcal{I}$. Similarly, the heuristic behind (3.33) is that up to $l = sN^{2/3}$ the process explores the second interval on some vertex $\{\mathbb{S}^w_{\theta_N}, w \in G_N\}$ about $N^{1/3}$ times the expression on the* LHS *of (3.32), whereas such interval is well approximated by $\mathcal{I}'_U \subseteq \mathcal{I}^n$ randomly carved around active point chosen uniformly* within *$\mathcal{I}^n$. Such $\mathcal{I}'_U$ has conditional expected length $\widehat{F}(|\mathcal{I}^n|)$, whose expectation for $\Gamma_\theta(2,1)$ variable $|\mathcal{I}|$ is $\gamma(\theta)F(\theta)$.*

Turning next to the proof of Lemma 3.9, consider the collection of exploration, labeled trees, where we assign labeled node k to the interval explored in step k, while ignoring the surplus edges (see [2, Fig.1] for an illustration of this tree). We further mark each node of these trees with the vertex $w \in G_N$ on which the interval lies and the process of points $X_k \in [0, \theta_N]$ around which the explored intervals are constructed. Then, for any $k \ge 0$, writing 0_* as the root of the tree containing node k, we define $d(k) = d_{\rm tree}(0_*, k)$ for the tree distance $d_{\rm tree}(\cdot,\cdot)$ (which count only the links on the unique path between any pair of connected nodes).

Consider the process $(X_k)_{k\ge0}$ restricted to a branch of an exploration tree, such that the initial location X_0 is distributed as ν on $\mathbb{S}_{\theta_N}$, where is ν any measure on $\mathbb{S}_{\theta_N}$. Taking k and k' such that $d(k') < d(k)$, introduce $X_k|_{(\mathcal{F}_{k'}, \widetilde{I}_{k'})}$ as the random variable X_k conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_{k'}$ and the interval $\widetilde{I}_{k'}$ built around $X_{k'}$. Let $P(k',k)$ be the unique path connecting two explorations times k' and k, then define

$$\varphi(k',k) = \max\{j \in P(k',k) : \widetilde{I}_j \text{ is not the first interval on its vertex }\}, \tag{3.34}$$

with the usual convention that the maximum of an empty set is taken as $-\infty$.

Lemma 3.12 *Let us fix two epochs k and k' from the exploration process such that they both belong to the same branch and that $d(k) < d(k')$. Then, writing $\pi_{N,k,k'}$ for the distribution of $X_k|_{(\mathcal{F}_{k'},\widetilde{I}_{k'})}$ on $\mathbb{S}_{\theta_N}$, and π for the normalised Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{S}_{\theta_N}$, there exists a deterministic $\rho < 1$ such that*

$$d_{TV}\left(\pi_{N,k,k'},\pi\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\rho^{f(k',k)}\right)$$

where d_{TV} is the total variation distance, and $f(k',k) = d_{tree}(\varphi(k',k),k)$.

Proof. First, consider the process $\Big(X_j, j \in P(k',k)\big|(\mathcal{F}_{k'},\widetilde{I}_{k'}), \varphi(k',k) = -\infty\Big)$. It is clear that this is an irreducible and aperiodic, Markov chain on a compact state space. Notice that the transition probability kernel of this Markov chain satisfies the minoration condition (iv) of Theorem 16.0.2 in [19].

Then, writing $\pi'_{k',k,N}$ as the distribution of $\Big(X_k\big|(\mathcal{F}_{k'},\widetilde{I}_{k'}), \varphi(k',k) = -\infty\Big)$, and π for the uniform measure on $\mathbb{S}_{\theta_N}$, and using the equivalence of statements (iv) and $(viii)$ of Theorem 16.0.2 in [19] there exists positive constant $\rho < 1$ such that

$$d_{TV}\left(\pi'_{k',k,N},\pi\right) < \rho^{d_{\text{tree}}(k,k')} \tag{3.35}$$

Note that $\pi'_{k',k,N}$ is primarily the measure $\pi_{k',k,N}$ conditioned on the event $(\varphi(k',k) = -\infty)$.

Next, let us assume that $(\varphi(k',k) \neq -\infty)$, then note that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_k \in A\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{k'},\widetilde{I}_{k'},X_{\varphi(k',k)}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(X_k \in A\middle|\,X_{\varphi(k',k)}\right), \tag{3.36}$$

since the distribution of X_k does not depend on the past prior to $\varphi(k',k)$. Therefore, in view of the above equation,

$$d_{TV}\left(\pi_{k',k,N},\pi\right) = \sup_A \left|\mathbb{E}\left(\pi_{\varphi(k,k'),k,N}(A)\right) - \pi(A)\right| \tag{3.37}$$

Then, applying Jensen's inequality

$$d_{TV}\left(\pi_{k',k,N},\pi\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_A \left|\pi_{N,k,\varphi(k',k)}(A) - \pi(A)\right|\right) \tag{3.38}$$

Thereafter, using (3.35)

$$d_{TV}\left(\pi_{k',k,N},\pi\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\rho^{d_{\text{tree}}(\varphi(k',k),k)}\right) \tag{3.39}$$

which concludes the proof. □

Proof of Lemma 3.9: Under the event E_0^k the interval $\widetilde{I}_{k+1}$ lies on a completely neutral circle $\mathbb{S}^w_{\theta_N}$. Letting

$$G(x,\widetilde{I}(v)) := |(\mathcal{I}' + x) \cap \widetilde{I}^n(v)|$$

and $l_N = sN^{2/3}$ we thus rewrite (3.32) as

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{2}{l_N^2} \sum_{k=0}^{l_N-1} \mathbf{1}_{E_0^k} \sum_{v\in\Theta_1^k} \mathbb{E}\left(G(X_{k+1},\widetilde{I}(v))\middle|\mathcal{F}_k\right) = F(\theta_\star)\Big(1 - \frac{1}{\beta_\star}\Big) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{P}. \tag{3.40}$$

Recall Remark 3.11 that for i.i.d. copy $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{I}'$ and an independent uniform point U on $\mathbb{S}_{\theta_N}$

$$\mathbb{E}[G(U,\mathcal{I})] = F(\theta_N) - \frac{F(\theta_N)^2}{\theta_N} \to F(\theta_\star)\Big(1 - \frac{1}{\beta_\star}\Big)\,, \tag{3.41}$$

as $N \to \infty$ (see (3.1) and (3.3)). Similar to (3.31) we further have that

$$0 \le k - |\Theta_1^k|\mathbf{1}_{E_0^k} \le k - |\Theta_1^k| + |\Theta_1^k|\mathbf{1}_{E_{\ge 1}^k} \le \nu_{\ge 2}^k + k\mathbf{1}_{E_{\ge 1}^k}\,,$$

and as shown at end of proof of Lemma 3.8, for $N \to \infty$

$$\frac{1}{l_N^2}\sum_{k=0}^{l_N-1} k\mathbf{1}_{E_{\ge 1}^k} \le \frac{\nu_{\ge 2}^{l_N}}{l_N} = \mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(l_N/N) \to 0\,.$$

Hence, as $N \to \infty$,

$$\frac{2}{l_N^2}\sum_{k=0}^{l_N-1}\left(k - |\Theta_1^k|\mathbf{1}_{E_0^k}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0\,,$$

which in combination with (3.41) implies that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{2}{l_N^2}\sum_{k=0}^{l_N-1}\mathbf{1}_{E_0^k}|\Theta_1^k|\,\mathbb{E}[G(U,\mathcal{I})] = F(\theta_\star)\Big(1-\frac{1}{\beta_\star}\Big) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{P}\,.$$

Thus, to get (3.40) and thereby complete the proof, it suffices to show that as $k \to \infty$,

$$\frac{1}{k^2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\{\sum_{v\in\Theta_1^k}\mathbf{1}_{E_0^k}\left[\mathbb{E}\left(G(X_{k+1},\widetilde{I}(v))\Big|\,\mathcal{F}_k\right) - \mathbb{E}\left(G(U,\mathcal{I})\right)\right]\right\}^2\right] \to 0. \tag{3.42}$$

However, since $|\Theta_1^k| = \nu_1^k$, and $\nu_1^k = k(1+\mathrm{o}(1))$, the above statement reduces to showing

$$\frac{1}{k^2}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{\substack{v,\,v'\,\in\,\Theta_1^k\\ v\,\neq\,v'}}\mathbf{1}_{E_0^k}\left\{\mathbb{E}\left(G(X_{k+1},\widetilde{I}(v))\Big|\,\mathcal{F}_k\right) - \mathbb{E}\left[G(U,\mathcal{I})\right]\right\}\left\{\mathbb{E}\left(G(X_{k+1},\widetilde{I}(v'))\Big|\,\mathcal{F}_k\right) - \mathbb{E}\left[G(U,\mathcal{I})\right]\right\}\right] \to 0 \tag{3.43}$$

Let us set

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Err}(v,v'k,N)\\ =\;&\mathbb{E}\left[\left\{\mathbb{E}\left(G(X_{k+1},\widetilde{I}(v))\Big|\,\mathcal{F}_k\right) - \mathbb{E}\left(G(U,\mathcal{I})\right)\right\}\left\{\mathbb{E}\left(G(X_{k+1},\widetilde{I}(v'))\Big|\,\mathcal{F}_k\right) - \mathbb{E}\left(G(U,\mathcal{I})\right)\right\}\Big|\,v,v'\in\Theta_1^k,E_0^k\right].\end{aligned}$$

Then (3.43) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{k^2}\sum_{\substack{v,\,v'\,\in\,\{1,\,\ldots\,,N\}\\ v\,\neq\,v'}}\mathbb{P}\Big(v,v'\in\Theta_1^k,E_0^k\Big)\;\mathrm{Err}(v,v',k,N). \tag{3.44}$$

Since $\mathbb{P}\left(v, v' \in \Theta_1^k, E_0^k\right) = \mathrm{O}(kN^{-1})^2$, it suffices to show that $\mathrm{Err}(v, v', k, N) \to 0$ as $k, N \to \infty$.

Define $\vartheta(v)$ as the exploration time when the first interval on vertex v was built and $\vartheta^*(v)$ as the exploration time of the common ancestor of the intervals built at $\vartheta(v)$ and k, such that its interval is the first explored interval on its vertex. Further, set $\vartheta^*(v, v') = \mathrm{argmin}\{d_{\mathrm{tree}}(\vartheta^*(v), k), d_{\mathrm{tree}}(\vartheta^*(v'), k)\}$. Then the above can be further reduced to proving the following:

(S) For $\vartheta(v), \vartheta(v'), k$ such that $d_{\mathrm{tree}}(\vartheta(v), k) = \Theta(\log k)$ and $d_{\mathrm{tree}}(\vartheta(v'), k) = \Theta(\log k)$, $\left|\mathbb{E}\left(G(X_{k+1}, \widetilde{I}(v))\middle|\mathcal{F}_k\right)\mathbb{E}\left(G(X_{k+1}, \widetilde{I}(v'))\middle|\mathcal{F}_k\right) - \left[\mathbb{E}\left(G(U, \mathcal{I})\right)\right]^2\right| \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$.

We remark here that the assumptions above concerning the order of $d_{\mathrm{tree}}(\vartheta(v), k)$ and $d_{\mathrm{tree}}(\vartheta(v'), k)$ are indeed valid since the number of pairs of v, v' which do not satisfy such conditions is $\mathrm{o}(k)$, and hence their contribution to (3.43) can be ignored.

Before we proceed further, let us observe the following facts which will be used in the proof of above statement (S). Since for any $j \leq sN^{2/3}$ probability of the event that interval $\widetilde{I}_j$ built at time j of exploration lies on a vertex with an already explored interval is $\mathrm{O}(N^{-1/3})$, we have the following:

(F1) For intervals belonging to the same branch built at times k, k' such that $d_{\mathrm{tree}}(k', k) = \Theta(\log k)$, probability of the event $\{\varphi(k', k) \in P(\vartheta(v), k)\}$ can be bounded from above by $\mathrm{O}(N^{-1/3}\log k)$, where $\varphi(k', k)$ is as defined in (3.34). By Lemma 3.12, we have for some $\rho < 1$

$$d_{TV}\left(\pi_{N,k,k'}, \pi\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\rho^{f(k',k)}\right), \tag{3.45}$$

where as before $f(k', k) = d_{\mathrm{tree}}(\varphi(k', k), k)$. However, $f(k', k) = \Theta(\log k)$ on a set of probability $\left(1 - \mathrm{O}(N^{-1/3}\log k)\right)$. Hence, $d_{TV}\left(\pi_{N,k,k'}, \pi\right) \to 0$ as $k, N \to \infty$.

(F2) For any k, writing $\pi_{N,k}$ for the distribution of X_k, $d_{TV}\left(\pi_{N,k}, \pi\right) \to 0$. Indeed, by construction we start a new cluster with sampling a point from the uniform distribution, which is invariant for the dynamics of the Markov chain running only on neutral vertices. Consequently, if $d_{\mathrm{tree}}(0_*, k) = \mathrm{o}(N^{1/3})$, $d_{TV}\left(\pi_{N,k}, \pi\right) \to 0$, However, due to the tree structure $d_{\mathrm{tree}}(0_*, k) = \mathrm{O}(\log k)$.

There are three cases to consider in order to prove the statement (S).

(A) The interval built at k belongs to a cluster different from the ones that are built at $\vartheta(v)$ and $\vartheta(v')$ one can invoke fact (F2) to conclude that $d_{TV}\left(\pi_{N,k,\vartheta(v),\vartheta(v')}, \pi\right) \to 0$.

(B) The intervals built at k and $\vartheta(v)$ belong to the same cluster and the interval built at $\vartheta(v')$ belongs to a different cluster. Note that in this case the distribution of X_k does not depend on $\widetilde{I}(v')$. By assumption $d_{\mathrm{tree}}(\vartheta(v), k) = \Theta(\log k)$, then either $d_{\mathrm{tree}}(\vartheta^*(v), k) = \Theta(\log k)$ or $d_{\mathrm{tree}}(\vartheta^*(v), \vartheta(v)) = \Theta(\log k)$ (or both). In the former case, use fact (F1) to conclude that $d_{TV}\left(\pi_{N,k,v}, \pi\right) \to 0$, where we write $\pi_{N,k,v}$ for the measure induced by $X_k|_{\left(\mathcal{F}_{\vartheta(v)}, \widetilde{I}(v)\right)}$, which in turn implies the required result. In the latter

case, note that the Markov chain running only on neutral vertices is reversible. Hence, one can use the first fact for $\vartheta^*(v), \vartheta(v)$ to conclude that $d_{TV}\left(\pi_{N,\vartheta^*(v),\vartheta(v)}, \pi\right) \to 0$ and then by the same arguments as in the proof of the second fact conclude that $d_{TV}\left(\pi_{N,k,\vartheta(v)}, \pi\right) \to 0$, since $\vartheta^*(v)$ plays a role of the root in this case. Note that the roles of v and v' can be interchanged without any change in the proof.

(C) All three intervals built at $\vartheta(v)$, $\vartheta(v')$ and k belong to the same cluster. By assumption both $d_{\text{tree}}(\vartheta(v), k) = \Theta(\log k)$ and $d_{\text{tree}}(\vartheta(v'), k) = \Theta(\log k)$, then either $d_{\text{tree}}(\vartheta^*(v,v'), k) = \Theta(\log k)$ or $d_{\text{tree}}(\vartheta^*(v,v'), \vartheta(v)) = \Theta(\log k)$ and $d_{\text{tree}}(\vartheta^*(v,v'), \vartheta(v')) = \Theta(\log k)$. In the former case, use fact (F1) with $\vartheta^*(v,v')$ and k to conclude that $d_{TV}\left(\pi_{N,k,v,v'}, \pi\right) \to 0$, where we write $\pi_{N,k,v,v'}$ for the measure induced by $X_k\big|_{(\mathcal{F}_{\max\{\vartheta(v),\vartheta(v')\}}, \widetilde{I}(v), \widetilde{I}(v'))}$. In the latter case, note that at least one of the intervals built at $\vartheta(v)$ and $\vartheta(v')$ lies on the same branch as the one built at $\vartheta^*(v,v')$. Without loss of generality let us assume that the interval built at $\vartheta(v)$ lies on the same branch as the one built at $\vartheta^*(v,v')$. As we already mentioned above, the Markov chain running only on neutral vertices is reversible. Hence, one can use the fact (F1) for $\vartheta^*(v,v')$ and $\vartheta(v)$ to conclude that $d_{TV}\left(\pi_{N,\vartheta^*(v,v'),\vartheta(v)}, \pi\right) \to 0$. Using exactly the same set of arguments as in case (B) for $\vartheta^*(v,v')$ and $\vartheta(v')$ we also conclude that $d_{TV}\left(\pi_{N,\vartheta^*(v,v'),\vartheta(v')}, \pi\right) \to 0$. Consequently $d_{TV}\left(\pi_{N,\vartheta^*(v,v'),\vartheta(v),\vartheta(v')}, \pi\right) \to 0$. By the same arguments as in the proof of the fact (F2) $d_{TV}\left(\pi_{N,k,\vartheta(v),\vartheta(v')}, \pi\right) \to 0$, since $\vartheta^*(v,v')$ plays a role of the root in this case, which leads to the main result of this lemma.

□

Proof of Lemma 3.10. Writing $V_{k+1} = F(\theta_N) - \mathbb{E}\big(|\widetilde{I}_{k+1}| \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}_k\big)$, it suffices to show that as $N \to \infty$,

$$R_N := \frac{1}{\lambda_N N^{1/3}} \sum_{k=0}^{sN^{2/3}-1} V_{k+1} \mathbf{1}_{E_1^k} \to \frac{s^2}{2}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{\beta_\star}\Big)(1 - \gamma(\theta_\star)) =: R_\infty \tag{3.46}$$

in L^2. That is, to show that $\mathbb{E}R_N \to R_\infty$ and

Claim 3.13 *With the above notation var$(R_N) \to 0$ when $N \to \infty$.*

Deferring the proof of Claim 3.13 to the end of the section, with V_{k+1} uniformly bounded, we complete the proof of Lemma 3.10 by showing that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} N^{-1/3} \sum_{k=1}^{sN^{2/3}} \mathbb{P}(E_1^k) = \frac{s^2}{2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\beta_\star}\right), \tag{3.47}$$

and that for $k, N \to \infty$ while $k = O(N^{2/3})$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(V_{k+1} \big| E_1^k\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} F(\theta_\star)(1 - \gamma(\theta_\star))\,. \tag{3.48}$$

We get (3.48) by precisely the same arguments we used in proving Lemma 3.9, whereas for

(3.47) we use a sandwich argument. Observe that

$$N^{-1/3}\mathbb{E}(|\Xi|) \geq \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_N N^{4/3}}\sum_{k=0}^{sN^{2/3-1}}\sum_{v\in\Theta_1^k}\mathbb{E}\left(|\widetilde{I}_{k+1}\cap\widetilde{I}^n(v)|\big|\mathcal{F}_k\right)\right) - \frac{1}{N^{1/3}}\left(\mathbb{E}(S)+\mathbb{E}(K)+\mathbb{E}(B'_{sN^{2/3}-1})\right), \tag{3.49}$$

where S is the total number of surplus edges till step $(sN^{2/3}-1)$; K is the total number of active points around which the intervals are sampled on the vertices having two or more explored intervals and $B'_{sN^{2/3}-1}$ is the number of active points at step $(sN^{2/3}-1)$ which are on the vertices having an explored interval or which will be connected to a surplus edge. Recall that we already showed that the total number of surplus edges till step $sN^{2/3}$ is of order constant, and by Proposition 3.4, K is $\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Moreover, $B'_{sN^{2/3}-1}$ is $\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Indeed, the ratio of number of links created at step k connected to a vertex having an explored interval to the total number of links created at step k is proportional to $\frac{k}{N}$. So that the probability of constructing an active point at step $k=cN^{2/3}$, $c\geq 0$ which is on the vertices having an explored interval is $\mathrm{O}(N^{-2/3})$ and since, by Proposition 3.2, the total number of active points at step $sN^{2/3}-1$ is $\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(N^{1/3})$, $B'_{sN^{2/3}-1}$ is $\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Consequently, the second set of terms of equation (3.49) converge to zero as N goes to infinity, and the first term converges to the desired limit by Lemma 3.9, thereby proving Lemma 3.10.

Next, for the upper bound, writing $\mathcal{A}'_k$ as the set of vertices which correspond to the active points A'_k, we see that

$$N^{-1/3}\mathbb{E}(|\Xi|) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_N N^{4/3}}\sum_{k=0}^{sN^{2/3-1}}\sum_{v\in\Theta_1^k}\mathbb{E}\left(|\widetilde{I}_{k+1}\cap\widetilde{I}^n(v)|\big|\mathcal{F}_k\right)\right) + \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_N N^{4/3}}\sum_{k=0}^{sN^{2/3-1}}\sum_{v\in\mathcal{A}'_k}\mathbb{E}\left(|\widetilde{I}_{k+1}\cap\widetilde{I}^n(v)|\big|\mathcal{F}_k\right)\right). \tag{3.50}$$

However, since $A'_k=\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(N^{1/3})$, the second term of the above expression converges to zero. Then, we can conclude (3.47), which in turn proves Lemma 3.10. □

Proof of Claim 3.13. The variance of R_N is the sum of individual variances and the covariances over all the pairs. For the sum of individual variances observe that, there exists $M>0$ such that

$$\mathrm{var}\left(V_{k+1}\mathbf{1}_{E_1^k}\right)\leq\mathbb{E}\left(V_{k+1}\mathbf{1}_{E_1^k}\right)^2\leq M\mathbb{P}\left(E_1^k\right)=\mathrm{O}\left(N^{-1/3}\right)$$

implying that $\frac{1}{N^{2/3}}\sum_{k=0}^{sN^{2/3}-1}\mathrm{var}\left(V_{k+1}\mathbf{1}_{E_1^k}\right)\to 0$ as $N\to\infty$.

For the sum of covariances over all pairs, notice that it suffices to show that for some $R>0$ and $0<q<1$, we have

$$N^{2/3}\mathrm{cov}\left(V_{k+1}\mathbf{1}_{E_1^k},V_{k'+1}\mathbf{1}_{E_1^{k'}}\right)\leq R\,\mathbb{E}\left(q^{f(k,k')}\right)$$

where $f(k,k')$ is as defined in Lemma 3.12.

In view of

$$\mathbb{E}\left(V_{k+1}\mathbf{1}_{E_1^k}V_{k'+1}\mathbf{1}_{E_1^{k'}}\right) \quad = \quad \mathbb{E}\left(V_{k+1}V_{k'+1}\middle|E_1^k\cap E_1^{k'}\right)\mathbb{P}\left(E_1^k\cap E_1^{k'}\right)$$

it suffices to prove the following

(C1) $N^{2/3}\left(\mathbb{P}\left(E_1^k\cap E_1^{k'}\right)-\mathbb{P}\left(E_1^k\right)\mathbb{P}\left(E_1^{k'}\right)\right)=\mathrm{o}(1)$

(C2) $\mathbb{E}\left(V_{k+1}V_{k'+1}\middle|E_1^k\cap E_1^{k'}\right)-\mathbb{E}\left(V_{k+1}\middle|E_1^k\right)\mathbb{E}\left(V_{k'+1}\middle|E_1^{k'}\right)=0$

Proof of (C2)*:* Notice that on the event $\left(E_1^k\cap E_1^{k'}\right)$, the intervals corresponding to the time steps k and k' cannot belong to the same vertex, which in turn implies that V_{k+1} and $V_{k'+1}$ are independent when conditioned on the event $\left(E_1^k\cap E_1^{k'}\right)$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(V_{k+1}V_{k'+1}\middle|E_1^k\cap E_1^{k'}\right) \quad = \quad \mathbb{E}\left(V_{k+1}\middle|E_1^k\cap E_1^{k'}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(V_{k'+1}\middle|E_1^k\cap E_1^{k'}\right).$$

Then, noticing that since V_{k+1} conditioned on $\left(E_1^k\cap E_1^{k'}\right)$ is related to only the length of the second interval, it will have no impact from the information provided by $E_1^{k'}$, implying

$$\mathbb{E}\left(V_{k+1}V_{k'+1}\middle|E_1^k\cap E_1^{k'}\right)=\mathbb{E}\left(V_{k+1}\middle|E_1^k\right)\mathbb{E}\left(V_{k'+1}\middle|E_1^{k'}\right).$$

Proof of (C1)*:* We shall introduce a new sequence of events $\widetilde{E}_{\geq 1}^k$, which are closely related to E_1^k, and we shall prove their asymptotic independence. More precisely, let us define $\widetilde{E}_{\geq 1}^k$ as the event that at time step $(k+1)$ at least one active point is created on an already visited vertex, then we shall prove

$$N^{2/3}\left[\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{E}_{\geq 1}^k\cap\widetilde{E}_{\geq 1}^{k'}\right)-\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{E}_{\geq 1}^k\right)\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{E}_{\geq 1}^{k'}\right)\right]\to 0. \tag{3.51}$$

Observe that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{E}_{\geq 1}^k\right)=\mathbb{E}\left(1-\exp\left(-\frac{1}{\lambda_N N}\sum_{v\in\Theta_{\geq 1}^k}|\widetilde{I}_{k+1}\cap I^n(v)|\right)\right)$$

implying

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{E}_{\geq 1}^k\right)=\frac{1}{\lambda_N N}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{v\in\Theta_{\geq 1}^k}|\widetilde{I}_{k+1}\cap I^n(v)|\right)+\mathrm{o}\left(N^{-1}\right).$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{E}_{\geq 1}^k\cap\widetilde{E}_{\geq 1}^{k'}\right)=\frac{1}{\lambda_N^2 N^2}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{v\in\Theta_{\geq 1}^k}|\widetilde{I}_{k+1}\cap I^n(v)|\sum_{w\in\Theta_{\geq 1}^{k'}}|\widetilde{I}_{k'+1}\cap I^n(w)|\right)+\mathrm{o}\left(N^{-1}\right).$$

Notice that for our purposes we can replace $\Theta^k_{\geq 1}$ and $\Theta^{k'}_{\geq 1}$, by Θ^k_1 and $\Theta^{k'}_1$, respectively, as the number of terms lost by performing this step is $\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}\left(N^{2/3}\right)$ (by Proposition 3.4). Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{E}^k_{\geq 1} \cap \widetilde{E}^{k'}_{\geq 1}\right) \\
= \; & \frac{1}{\lambda_N^2 N^2}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{v\in\Theta^k_1}\sum_{w\in\Theta^{k'}_1}\mathbb{E}\left(|\widetilde{I}_{k+1}\cap I^n(v)|\,|\widetilde{I}_{k'+1}\cap I^n(w)|\Big|\,\Theta^k_1,\Theta^{k'}_1\right)\right) + \mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}\left(N^{-4/3}\right) + \mathrm{o}\left(N^{-1}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let us consider a typical term of the above product, and note that the two intersections correspond to two different Markov chains in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 3.9. Thus to conclude (3.51), we need to ensure that these two chains are asymptotically independent as the distance between k and k' grows. For the paths connecting the vertex v to $\widetilde{I}_{k+1}$ and vertex w to $\widetilde{I}_{k'+1}$, let us define $z(v,w,k,k')$ as the smallest exploration time point after which the two paths do not intersect. Now using the same arguments as set forth in the proof of Lemma 3.9, on the paths from $z(v,w,k,k')$ to $\widetilde{I}_{k+1}$ and $\widetilde{I}_{k'+1}$, resectively, and invoking similar arguments on the paths connecting $z(v,w,k,k')$ to v and w, we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left(|\widetilde{I}_{k+1}\cap I^n(v)|\,|\widetilde{I}_{k'+1}\cap I^n(w)|\Big|\,\Theta^k_1,\Theta^{k'}_1\right) \\
= \; & \mathbb{E}\left(|\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_1\cap \mathcal{J}_1{}^c|\right)\mathbb{E}\left(|\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_2\cap \mathcal{J}_2{}^c|\right) + \mathrm{o}(1)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_1$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_2$, $\mathcal{J}_1$ and $\mathcal{J}_2$ are independent and identically distributed intervals carved out of $\mathbb{S}_\theta$ distributed as $\widetilde{I}$, described earlier in the exploration process of Section 2.1.

Finally, using the fact that the number of active points at each time step is $\mathrm{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(N^{1/3})$ and noting that the way of choosing an active point (if it exists) for the next step has nothing to do with the way it has been created we can conclude (C1), thereby completing the proof of Claim 3.13. □

3.2 Joint convergence of component sizes

Recall the statement of Theorem 1.3. In this section, we shall conclude the proof of this theorem using results from previous sections.

As pointed out in [2], Theorem 1.3 primarily has two parts:

1. First is to prove that the excursions of the limit process are matched by the excursions of the breadth first random walk.
2. Second is to arrange these excursions in the decreasing order. This can be achieved if one can ascertain that there exists a random point after which one is sure (with high probability) not to see large excursions.

In order to settle the first issue, we shall invoke Lemmas 7 and 8 of [2], which can be applied verbatim to our case, together with Proposition 3.1 proved in previous subsection.

Thus, we only need to be concerned about the second issue, for which we shall need to prove an appropriate version of Lemma 9 of [2] suited to our case.

Like in [2], let us define

$$T(y) = \min\{s : W^{a,\lambda_*,\theta_*}(s) = -y\},$$
$$T_N(y) = \min\{i : Y_N(i) = -\lfloor yn^{1/3} \rfloor\}.$$

Notice that as a consequence of Proposition 3.1

$$N^{-2/3} T_N(y) \quad \to_d \quad T(y).$$

Therefore, the following lemma completes the proof.

Lemma 3.14 *Let us denote by $p(N, y, \delta)$ the probability that the* QRG *with the parameters (θ_N, λ_N) that satisfy (3.1), contains a component of size at least $\delta N^{2/3}$ which does not contain any vertex i with $1 \le i \le yN^{1/3}$. Then,*

$$\lim_{y\to\infty} \limsup_N p(N, y, \delta) = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \delta > 0.$$

Proof. Fix $\delta > 0$. Let $v_{\mathcal{C}_i}$ be the minimal vertex of the cluster $\mathcal{C}_i$, then for an interval $\mathfrak{I} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$, define

$$q(N, \mathfrak{I}) = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{\mathcal{C}_i:\text{ clusters}} 1_{\left(|\mathcal{C}_i| \ge \delta N^{2/3}; v_{\mathcal{C}_i} \in N^{1/3}\mathfrak{I}\right)} \right). \tag{3.52}$$

Then conditioned on arranging the components in a decreasing order of their sizes, the labels of the vertices of any given component are going to be in random order. For a component $\mathcal{C}_i$ of size $bN^{2/3}$, define

$$\chi_N(\mathcal{C}_i) = N^{-1/3} v_{\mathcal{C}_i},$$

and

$$\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{C}_i} = N^{-2/3} \left(\text{number of vertices in the component } \mathcal{C}_i\right).$$

Then note that

$$\mathbb{P}(v_{\mathcal{C}_i} > N^{1/3}x | \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{C}_i}) = \left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{C}_i} N^{2/3}}{N}\right)^{N^{1/3}x},$$

implying

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\chi_N(\mathcal{C}_i) > y | \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{C}_i}\right) = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{C}_i} y}}{1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{C}_i}}} \mathbb{P}\left(\chi_N(\mathcal{C}_i) \le 1 | \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{C}_i}\right) + \mathrm{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \tag{3.53}$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(v_{\mathcal{C}_i} \in [yN^{1/3}, \infty)\Big) = \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{P}\Big(v_{\mathcal{C}_i} \in [yN^{1/3}, \infty) | \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{C}_i}\Big)\right). \tag{3.54}$$

At this point, conditional on cluster sizes being $|\mathcal{C}_i| = bN^{2/3}$, we note that one can adopt the proof of Proposition 3.4 to the original exploration process restricted to the construction of $\mathcal{C}_i$ in order to derive similar results for $\nu_{\ge 3}^{\mathcal{C}_i}$, the number of explored intervals belonging to $\mathcal{C}_i$ sampled by the end of the construction of $\mathcal{C}_i$, which belong to vertices (circles), having

at least 3 such intervals each. Then, observing that $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{C}_i} N^{2/3} \geq \frac{1}{2}(bN^{2/3} - \nu_{\geq 3}^{\mathcal{C}_i})$, we have for $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{C}_i} \geq \frac{1}{2}b - \frac{1}{2}\frac{N^{1/3+\varepsilon}}{N^{2/3}}\right) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\nu_{\geq 3}^{\mathcal{C}_i} \leq N^{1/3+\varepsilon}\right) = 1 - \mathrm{o}(N^{-1/3}),$$

implying that $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{C}_i} \in \left(\frac{b}{3}, b\right)$ with probability $\left(1 - \mathrm{o}(N^{-1/3})\right)$. Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{P}\left(v_{\mathcal{C}_i} \in [yN^{1/3}, \infty) \middle| \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{C}_i}\right)\right) \quad \leq \quad \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-by/3}}{1 - \mathrm{e}^{-b/3}} \mathbb{P}\left(v_{\mathcal{C}_i} \in [0, N^{1/3}]\right) + \mathrm{o}(N^{-1/3}).$$

Recalling the definition of $q(N, \mathfrak{I})$ from (3.52), and conditioning on M_b the number of clusters of size $bN^{2/3}$, while observing that given the sizes of components the minimal vertices of various different components are identically distributed, we get

$$q(N, [y, \infty)) \quad = \quad \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{b=\delta}^{\infty} M_b \mathbb{P}\left(v_{\mathcal{C}_i} \in [yN^{1/3}, \infty) \middle| |\mathcal{C}_i| = bN^{2/3}\right)\right).$$

This, together with (3.53) implies that

$$q(N, [y, \infty)) \quad \leq \quad \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\delta y/3}}{1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\delta/3}} q(N, [0, 1]) + \mathrm{o}(1).$$

Now observe that $p(N, y, \delta) \leq q(N, [y, \infty))$, then in view of the above set of inequalities, in order to prove the theorem, it suffices to prove that

$$\sup_N q(N, [0, 1]) < \infty. \tag{3.55}$$

However, notice that the expected number of components of size larger than $\delta N^{2/3}$, with minimal vertex smaller than $N^{1/3}$ is bounded above by $N^{1/3}\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}_0| \geq \delta N^{2/3})$, where $\mathcal{C}_0$ is a typical component.

Note that in proving the first part of Theorem 1.2, we estimated such probabilities by adopting a technique of over counting, and obtained an upper bound in Section 2.2. However, the computations in Section 2.2 were performed at criticality, whereas now we need to perform the same computations in the case of critical window. Recall from Section 2.2 the stopping time τ as the size of the over counting tree, then $\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}_0| \geq \delta N^{2/3}) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\tau \geq \delta N^{2/3}\right)$. Thus, taking these observations into account, proving (3.55) is equivalent to proving the following

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau^W \geq \delta N^{2/3}) \leq N^{-1/3}\mathrm{const} \tag{3.56}$$

where τ^W is defined precisely the same way as τ, however in the critical window. Finally, without going into the details, we remark that the above inequality can easily be concluded by mimicking the computations of Section 2.2. □

References

[1] **M. Aizenman, A. Klein, C.M. Newman** (1993). Percolation methods for disordered quantum Ising models, *Mathematics, Physics, Biology,* R. Kotecky, ed., 124, World Scientic, Singapore.

[2] **D. Aldous** (1997). Brownian excursions, critical random graphs and the multiplicative coalescent. *The Annals of Probab.* Vol. 25, 812-854.

[3] **S. Bhamidi, R. van der Hofstad, J. S. H. van Leeuwaarden** (2010). Scaling limits for critical inhomogeneous random graphs with finite third moments. *Elect. J. of Prabab.* vol. 15, 1682-1703. MR2735378

[4] **S. Bhamidi, R. van der Hofstad, J. S. H. van Leeuwaarden** (2012). Novel scaling limits for critical inhomogeneous random graphs. *The Annals of Probab.* Vol. 40, 2299-2361.

[5] **B. Bollobás** (1984). The evolution of random graphs. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* Vol. 286, 257-274.

[6] **B. Bollobás, S. Janson, O. Riordan** (2007). The phase transition in inhomogeneous random graphs. *Random Struc. Alg.* Vol. 31, 3-122.

[7] **M. Campanino, A. Klein, J.F. Perez** (1991). Localization in the ground state of the Ising model with a random transverse eld. *Comm. Math. Phys.* Vol. 135, 499515.

[8] **P. Erdős and A. Rényi** (1960). On the evolution of random graphs. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hung. Acad. Sci.* Vol. 5, 17-61.

[9] **S. N. Ethier, T. G. Kurtz** (1986). Markov processes: characterization and convergence. *Wiley, New York.*

[10] **G. Grimmett, D. Stirzaker** (2001). Probability and random processes. *Oxford University Press, Oxford.*

[11] **H. O. Hartley, H. A. David** (1954). Universal bounds for mean range and extreme observation. *Ann. Math. Statistics.*, Vol. 25, 85-99.

[12] **D. Ioffe** (2009). Stochastic geometry of classical and quantum Ising models. *Meth. Contemp. Math. Stat. Physics*, R. Kotecky ed., LNM 1970, 87-26, Springer.

[13] **D. Ioffe and A. Levit** (2007). Long range order and giant components of quantum random graphs. *Markov Proc. Rel. Fields*, Vol. 13, 469-492.

[14] **S. Janson** (2007). On a random graph related to quantum theory. *Comb. Probab. and Computing*, Vol. 16, 757-766.

[15] **A. Joseph** (2011). The component sizes of a critical random graph with given degree sequence. Preprint http://arxiv.org/pdf/1012.2352.pdf

[16] **G. F. Lawler and V. Limic** (2010). Random walk: a modern introduction. *Cambridge University Press.*

[17] **A. M-. Lof** (1986). Symmetric sampling procedures, general epidemic processes and their threshold limit theorems. *J. Appl. Prob.* Vol. 23, 265-282.

[18] **T. Łuczak** (1990). Component behavior near the critical point of the random graph process. *Random Struc. Alg.* Vol. 1, 287-310.

[19] **S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie** (2005). Markov chains and stochastic stability. *Springer-Verlag.*

[20] **A. Nachmias and Y. Peres** (2010). The critical random graph, with martingales. *Israel J. Math.* Vol. 176, 29-41.

[21] **A. Nachmias and Y. Peres** (2010). Critical percolation on random regular graphs. *Random Struc. Alg.* Vol. 36, 111-148.

[22] **O. Riordan** (2012). The phase transition in the configuration model. *Comb. Probab. and Computing*, Vol. 21, 265-299.

[23] **T. Turova** (2011). Survey of scalings for the largest connected component in inhomogeneous random graphs. *Progress in Probability.* Vol. 64, 259-275.

[24] **T. Turova** (2013). Diffusion approximation for the components in critical inhomogeneous random graphs of rank 1. *Random Struc. Alg.* Vol. 43, 486539.